

REMARKS

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9, and 11-27 are pending in the present application. Reconsideration of this application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Personal Interview Conducted

Applicant appreciates the Examiner for the personal interview conducted with Applicant's representative, Esther H. Chong, on April 6, 2006, and for the Examiner's Interview Summary provided at the end of the interview. During the interview, claim 1 as amended herein was discussed in view of the present §103 rejection and the Examiner agreed that such amendment would overcome the present rejection. Other independent claims are amended in the similar manner as claim 1. The arguments discussed during the interview are merely highlighted below.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejection

Claims 1, 4, 6, 9 and 11-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Arsenault et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,658,661) in view of the Program Guide for Digital Television ATSC Standard A/55 (ATSC A/55). This rejection, insofar as it pertains to the presently pending claims, is respectfully traversed.

Without acquiescing to any of the Examiner's allegations made in rejecting the claims, independent claim 1 has been amended according to the claim amendments discussed during the interview. Other independent claims have been amended in the similar manner.

As pointed out during the interview, Arsenault et al. does not specify what 'program guide information' is and discloses sending such program guide information for different time periods at non-uniform time intervals. Arsenault nowhere states that such program guide information is or can be EITs or ETTs. Similarly, ATSC A/55 does not teach ETTs at all and thus does not overcome the deficiencies of Arsenault et al.

As pointed out during the interview, ATSC A/55's DIP (description information parcel) cannot be equated to ETT since ETT is a term well established in the ATSC standards. Also, page 33, lines 1-4 of ATSC A/55 discloses that the information parcel such as DIP is information not easily acquired in table format. ETT is an extended text table.

Further, ATSC A/55 nowhere discloses the uniform interval transmission of the ETTs, as recited in the claims. The portion (page 40, lines 1-12) of ATSC A/55, cited by the Examiner to support his allegation, does not teach sending DIPs (or ETTs) at uniform intervals, but is directed to how to calculate a cycle time for each DIP.

Also, ATSC A/65 mentioned in the Background of the Invention section of the present invention may mention ETTs, but does not teach or suggest the uniform interval transmissions of the ETTs, as required by the claims.

Therefore, Arsenault et al. and ATSC A/55, either taken singularly or in combination thereof, do not teach or suggest, *inter alia*, "setting the issuance intervals for the EITs, respectively, to be non-uniform based on the range of broadcasting time which each of the EITs is assigned to cover...; and setting a uniform interval for a plurality of extended text tables

(ETTs) to be transmitted in sequence" (emphasis added) as recited in independent claim 1. Other independent claims recite the similar features. The present invention, as set forth in each independent claim, provides efficient and effective broadcast data transmissions, and is therefore advantageous over the prior art systems.

Accordingly, the invention as recited in independent claims 1, 4, 6, 9, 19 and 21-27 is patentable over the applied references, and the rejection is improper and should be withdrawn as agreed during the interview.

CONCLUSION

For the foregoing reasons and in view of the above clarifying amendments, the Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw all of the objections and rejections of record, and an early issuance of a Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

The Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final Action, in that it raises no new issues but merely places the claims in a form more clearly patentable over the references of record. In the alternative, the Examiner is respectfully requested to enter this Amendment After Final Action in that it reduces the issues for appeal.

Application No. 09/828,865
Amendment dated April 27, 2006
After Final Office Action of November 3, 2005

Docket No.: 0465-1335PUS1

Should there be any matters which need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Esther H. Chong (Registration No. 40,953) at the telephone number of the undersigned below.

Dated: April 27, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

By Esther H. Chong
Esther H. Chong
Registration No.: 40,953
BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP
8110 Gatehouse Road
Suite 100 East
P.O. Box 747
Falls Church, Virginia 22040-0747
(703) 205-8000
Attorney for Applicant